



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,841	02/08/2006	Norbert Nessler	2005-042	8532
27569	7590	02/04/2010	EXAMINER	
PAUL AND PAUL 2000 MARKET STREET SUITE 2900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			HUPCZEY, JR, RONALD JAMES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2010 ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@PAULANDPAUL.COM
claire@paulandpaul.com
fpanna@paulandpaul.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,841

Applicant(s)

NESSLER, NORBERT

Examiner

RONALD HUPCZEY, JR

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 and 4-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments and remarks, filed on October 1st, 2009, have been fully considered by the Examiner. Claims 1-2 and 4 - 20 are currently pending with claim 3 cancelled and claims 1, 4, 13 and 14 amended. Applicant's amendments to the specification obviate the previously filed objection to the specification. Applicant's submission of the replacement drawing sheets obviates the previously filed objection to the drawings. Lastly, Applicant's amendment to claim 14 obviates the previously filed rejection under the claim under both 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 101. The following is a complete response to the October 1st, 2009 communication.

Specification

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

3. It is respectfully requested that Applicant review their present specification and ensure that each of the above sections are present and clearly labeled. Such will increase the clarity of the specification and expedite future prosecution.

Claim Objections

4. It is requested that Applicant review claims 1-2 and 4-20 to ensure that each claim is grammatically correct and clear in its meaning. For example, it is suggested by the Examiner that in claim 1, line 7 that the "which" appearing in the middle of the line be replaced with "wherein each" and in claim 1, line 9, after the "resistance (54)," the word "and" be added. Such corrections will fix the grammatical errors and make the scope of the claim clearer.

5. It is further noted that MPEP 608.01(m) sets forth that "Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description and the drawings may be used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims. The reference characters, however, should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. *The use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims.*"[emphasis added]. It is unclear if Applicant is currently relying on the reference characters in the claims to refer to desired subject matter to be claimed but if such is the case, Applicant is requested to

included such subject matter in language of the claims (for example the desired number of resistances of the equivalent resistance circuit) instead of as reference characters in the parentheses.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-2 and 4-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the claim currently recites in lines 4-6 “an equivalent resistance circuit (70) representing at least one layer of the human skin, e.g. the epidermis, the corium, and the hypodermis including fatty tissue”. Such a limitation is seen by the Examiner as unclear and confusing rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. MPEP 2173.05(d) discussing exemplary claim language (with specific regard given to the use of “for example”) recites that the “Description of examples or preferences is properly set forth in the specification rather than the claims. If stated in the claims, examples and preferences >may< lead to confusion over the intended scope of a claim. In those instances where it is not clear whether the claimed narrower range is a limitation, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be made”. While Applicant’s claim 1 recites “e.g.” instead of “for example”, it is well established that “e.g.” is considered short-hand for “for example”. As such, it is the Examiner’s interpretation that the “e.g. the epidermis, the corium and the hypodermis including fatty tissue” limitation appearing in the claim is unclear because it does not positively recite if such layers of the human skin are

required by the claim or are being referenced solely as examples of layers of the skin which the equivalent resistance circuit representing at least one layer of human skin may represent. As a result, the intended scope of the claim is unclear. It is suggested by the Examiner that if Applicant intends for the at least one equivalent resistance circuit to be tied to a specific layer of the human skin, that the specific layer be positively recited in the claim. Claims 2 and 4-13 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Again regarding claim 1, since it is unclear if each of the exemplary layers of human skin are being positively recited, each layer, at least until positively recited, cannot be relied upon as antecedent basis for limitations appearing in the claim after the "e.g." limitation since the claim as currently written does not require any of the recited layers of human skin to be represented by the equivalent resistance circuit. It is noted that in this instance, the limitation appearing in lines 10-11 of the claim of "the equivalent resistance circuit (70) representing the hypodermis is formed by the reactive resistance (54)" is at issue. The at least one equivalent resistance circuit can represent any of the "epidermis, corium and the hypodermis including fatty tissue" or can also represent options which are not presently recited in the claim. As such, the limitation of "the hypodermis" in line 10 lacks antecedent basis in the claim. It is further noted that the limitation in line 6 currently recites "the hypodermis including fatty tissue" which is considered by the Examiner as different from "the hypodermis" appearing in line 11. Again, claims 2 and 4-13 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 1.

Lastly, with regard to claim 1, lines 4-7 recite "an equivalent resistance circuit (70) representing at least one layer of the human skin, e.g. the epidermis, the corium and the hypodermis including fatty tissue, and consisting of at least two resistances (41, 42, 43, 54)".

Lines 9-11 of the claim further recite “the resistance of the equivalent resistance circuit (70) representing the hypodermis is formed by the reactive resistance (54)”. In view of these two recitations, it is unclear which resistance the recitation of lines 9-11 is referring to. Lines 4-7 set forth that the circuit (70) requires at least two resistances and as such, it is unclear if the resistance of lines 9-11 refers to the first resistance, the second resistance or refers to the total resistance of the equivalent resistance circuit. Claims 2 and 4-13 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 2, since it is unclear if the limitation of claim 1 which forms the antecedent basis for the limitation appearing in claim 2 has been positively recited in claim 1 as noted above, it is further unclear if claim 2 is positively recited or required by the device. Additionally, it is unclear if the limitation of the claim has antecedent basis since the limitation appearing in lines 10-11 of claim 1 has not positively recited. Claims 4-13 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 6, since it is unclear if the limitation of claim 1 which forms the antecedent basis for the “reactive resistance” limitation appearing in the last line of claim 6 has been positively recited in claim 1 as noted above, it is further unclear if claim 6 is positively recited or required by the device. Additionally, it is unclear if the limitation of the claim has antecedent basis since the limitation appearing in lines 10-11 of claim 1 has not positively recited. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 8, the claim currently recites “that each peripheral impedance circuit (60) is connected to the terminal of the horizontal equivalent resistance (42)”. While the remainder of the claim recites the location of the specific circuit (70), each of claims 5 and 7 as

well as claim 8 fail to set forth antecedent basis for "the terminal of the horizontal equivalent resistance (42) which is unconnected at the periphery". Additionally, while claim 5 sets forth that the horizontal equivalent resistances have "one terminal" and "other ends" it is unclear which of these two portions the "the terminal" of claim 8 comprises. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 9, the claim currently recites "that each peripheral impedance circuit (6) consists of one or more, preferably two, serially connected peripheral cells (71)" and further recites "wherein the other ends of the horizontal peripheral resistances (42') are connected to the horizontal equivalent resistance (42) or the horizontal peripheral resistance (42') of the equivalent resistance circuits (70) or peripheral cells (71) adjacent in the column and row directions". While the claim recites that there are preferably two peripheral cells, the claim as currently written only requires one peripheral cell per the "consists of one or more" limitation. As a result, it is unclear how only one cell can be serially connected to itself. Additionally, it is unclear how the other ends of the horizontal peripheral resistances (42') can be connected to the horizontal peripheral resistances (42') of the equivalent resistance circuit (70) when the equivalent resistance circuit is only disclosed (see claim 6) as being comprised of four horizontal equivalent resistances (42) and likewise it is unclear how they can be connected to peripheral cells in adjacent column/rows when only one peripheral cell is required by the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 10, the claim sets forth "peripheral impedance circuit (60)" therein. There is however, insufficient antecedent basis for such a limitation. It is noted that claim 6 not 5 sets forth the peripheral impedance circuit (60).

Regarding claim 11, since it is unclear if the limitation of claim 1 which forms the antecedent basis for the limitation appearing in claim 11 of “representing the muscle layer” has been positively recited in claim 1 as noted above, it is unclear if claim 11 is positively reciting or requiring such a limitation. Additionally, it is unclear if the limitation of the claim has antecedent basis since the limitation appearing in lines 5-6 of claim 1 has not positively recited. Claim 12, is rejected due to its dependency on claim 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Again regarding claim 11, the limitation of “the spatial measuring range of the temperature sensor (90)” lacks antecedent basis in the claims. Claim 12 is rejected due to its dependency on claim 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 14, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for the same reasoning as that of the rejection of claim 1 above. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 15, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for the same reasoning as that of the rejection of claim 1 above. Claims 16-20 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 15. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 16, the claim currently recites “the centers of the measuring electrodes” therein. There is however, insufficient antecedent basis for such a limitation. It is noted that no shape or arrangement of each of the measuring electrodes appears in the claim which the Examiner would be able to infer that there inherently existed a center for each as claimed. Claims 17-20 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 16. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessler et al ("Testing Device for Surgical Grounding Plates") in view of Pethig ("Dielectric Properties of Biological Materials: Biophysical and Medical Applications").

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Nessler discloses a device for testing a neutral electrode for use in electrosurgery comprising a measuring surface (gold-plated surface, pg. 2388) formed from a plurality of measuring electrodes (1 cm² squares, pg. 2388) whereon the neutral electrode may be applied. Nessler further discloses the measuring electrode to be connected to an equivalent resistance circuit ("simulate the human skin", "resistances simulate the specific skin impedance", pg. 2388) containing at least two resistances and representing at least one layer of the human skin. Additionally, Nessler et al discloses the equivalent resistance circuit in thermal contact with a temperature sensor (thermo-sensors, pg. 2389). Nessler et al fails to disclose for

one resistance of the equivalent resistance circuit to be formed by a reactive resistance formed by capacitance. Pethig discloses an electric equivalent model of stratum corneum of the skin to be formed by two resistors and one capacitor (see figure 9, pg. 465, left column, 1st paragraph). Pethig further discloses the need to model the capacitance found in various tests conducted throughout the reference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include some reactive resistance element (i.e. capacitor) within the equivalent resistance network to better model an equivalent electronic skin model. Such a combination is supported by the research provided by Pethig in the modeling of the stratum corneum and the various references included within the document to provide a representative of capacitance with any electronic model of the human skin.

Regarding claim 4, Nessler discloses the device connectable to an alternating voltage source (Technical Data, pg. 2388) and for the voltage source to have a variable frequency (Technical Data, pg. 2388).

Regarding claim 5, Nessler discloses the measuring electrodes to be arranged in a matrix form of columns and rows (1 cm² squares, pg. 2388 and see figure 1).

Regarding claim 7, Nessler discloses the inclusion of a periphery of the measuring surface (see the surfaces of the measurement system in figure 1) and discloses that each of the measuring electrodes have an equivalent impedance circuit (which can be called an peripheral impedance circuit) with at least one temperature sensor associated therewith ("simulate the human skin", "resistances simulate the specific skin impedance", pg. 2388 and thermo-sensors, pg. 2389).

Regarding claim 13, Nessler discloses the temperature sensor to be in thermal contact with the equivalent resistance circuit and formed from transistors (thermo-sensors, pg. 2389).

11. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessler et al ("Testing Device for Surgical Grounding Plates") in view of Pethig ("Dielectric Properties of Biological Materials: Biophysical and Medical Applications") and further in view of Nessler et al ("The Neutral Electrode in Electrosurgery, A Risk For The Patient?").

Regarding claim 6, Nessler et al ("Testing ...") discloses a device to contain an equivalent resistance circuit. Nessler et al ("Testing ...") fails to disclose any specific structure related to the equivalent resistance circuit. Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") discloses an equivalent resistance circuit containing a central node connected to one terminal of four horizontal resistances (R_h) and one terminal to each a first and second vertical resistance (R_v) (see figures 5 and 6). Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") further discloses the opposite ends of the horizontal equivalent resistances to be connected to other horizontal resistances in the network and for one vertical equivalent resistance to be connected to the electrode (see figures 5 and 6). Additionally, Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") discloses a second vertical equivalent resistance to be connected to ground (see figures 5 and 6). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the equivalent resistance circuit model of Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") with the general device disclosed in Nessler et al ("Testing ...") to allow for a device with a equivalent resistance circuit representing the multiple layers of human skin. Both devices are directed toward the same field of invention and current techniques in circuit construction readily allows for such a network to be utilized.

Regarding claim 7, Nessler ("Testing ...") discloses the inclusion of a periphery of the measuring surface (see the surfaces of the measurement system in figure 1) and discloses that each of the measuring electrodes have an equivalent impedance circuit (which can be called an peripheral impedance circuit) with at least one temperature sensor associated therewith ("simulate the human skin", "resistances simulate the specific skin impedance", pg. 2388 and thermo-sensors, pg. 2389).

Regarding claim 8, Nessler ("Testing ...") fails to disclose the arrangement of the arrangement of the plurality of equivalent resistance circuits. Nessler ("The Neutral...") has been relied upon in the above rejection of claim 6 to teach the arrangement of the multiple equivalent resistance circuits. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that one of the peripheral impedance circuit (taken as the equivalent resistance circuit on the peripheral of the test surface) would have a terminal connected to an adjacent equivalent resistance circuit.

Regarding claim 9, Nessler ("Testing...") fails to disclose the specific structure of the equivalent resistance circuit. Nessler ("The Neutral...") has been relied on in the above rejection of claim 6 to teach the arrangement of each equivalent resistance circuit. With the peripheral impedance circuit taken as a peripheral equivalent impedance circuit, each one would consist of a cell having a central node connected to one terminal of four horizontal resistances (R_h) and one terminal to each a first and second vertical resistance (R_v) (see figures 5 and 6). Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") further discloses the opposite ends of the horizontal equivalent resistances to be connected to other horizontal resistances in the network and for one vertical equivalent resistance to be connected to the electrode (see figures 5 and 6). Additionally, Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") discloses a second vertical equivalent resistance to be connected to ground (see

figures 5 and 6). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the equivalent resistance circuit model of Nessler et al ("The Neutral ...") with the general device disclosed in Nessler et al ("Testing ...") to allow for a device with a equivalent resistance circuit representing the multiple layers of human skin. Both devices are directed toward the same field of invention and current techniques in circuit construction readily allows for such a network to be utilized.

Regarding claim 10, in view of the above combination of Nessler ("Testing...") and Nessler ("The Neutral...") with specific regard to figures 5 and 6 of Nessler ("The Neutral.."), the device would be grounded through a terminal resistance circuit such as the resistors modeling the muscle which lead to the ground.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed October 1st, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is first noted that while claims 15-20 were previously indicated as allowable, upon further consideration by the Examiner, claims 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for the reasoning proffered above. As a result, this action is **non-final**.

In response to Applicant's argument on pages 14-15 of the Remarks that Nessler in view of Pethig fails to render obvious the use of a reactive resistance (claim 1) and for that resistance to be formed by capacitance (claim 2), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's attention is first directed to the above proffered rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. In view of this rejection, it is currently unclear in the claim if the hypodermis which is formed by the reactive resistance is even positively recited or required by the claim. It is further noted that

while Applicant is contending that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a capacitor/reactive resistance to model different percentages of fat within the hypodermis which raising a too high temperature in the hypodermis part) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Pethig is being relied upon to teach general equivalent circuit formations for a layer of the skin and for such equivalent circuit formation to be used when forming the equivalent circuit for the hypodermis. Since the claim only recites the hypodermis and does not address the technical problem as contended by Applicant on page 15 of the Remarks, it remains the Examiner's position that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would readily appreciate when forming an equivalent circuit for any of the layers of the human skin that resistors, capacitors or a combination of both as taught in Pethig can be utilized to better tailor the equivalent resistance circuit to the correct properties of the layer of skin.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RONALD HUPCZEY, JR whose telephone number is (571)270-5534. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 A.M. to 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. J. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3739

/Michael Peffley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739

RJH